

THE BOMBAY COURIER.

[PUBLISHED TWICE A-WEEK, — EVERY SATURDAY AND TUESDAY MORNING. — PRICE 13 RUPEES PER QUARTER.]

[VOL. XLV.]

TUESDAY, 30 MAY, 1837.

[NO. 9399]

FOR MAURITIUS.—To sail positively on the 1st June.—The *Palmyra* W. Loader, Commander, has good accommodations, and carries a surgeon. For passage apply to Messrs. McGregor Brownrigg and Co.—23d May.

N. B. As the ship returns immediately, it offers a desirable opportunity for invalids desirous to make a short voyage.

FOR LIVERPOOL.—The fast sailing Ship *LINTIN*, J. GILLMAN, Commander, will have quick despatch, and carries a Surgeon.—For Freight or Passage apply to

HIGGINSON AND CARDWELL, Rampart Row, 30th May, 1837.

FOR LIVERPOOL.—The *Mary Bibby* will have quick despatch, for freight or passage apply to EDMOND, BIBBY, AND CO. 30th May, 1837.

FOR LIVERPOOL.—The fine Ship *RANGER*, Richard Ainley, Commander; burthen per Register 516 Tons, will be dispatched early in June. For Freight or Passage, having superior accommodations, apply to GEORGE S. KING, Bombay, 30th May, 1837.

FOR LIVERPOOL.—The Brig *Rapid*, 240 Tons, T. J. Head, Commander, has accommodation for a few Passengers. For Freight or Passage apply to Messrs. Owen and Co.—Bombay, 30th May, 1837.

FOR OPIUM TO CHINA, the *Emily Jane*, T. Randle, Commander, for freight, having immediate despatch, apply at the office of Messrs. W. Nicol and Co.—Rampart Row, 30th May 1837,

FOR FREIGHT TO CHINA.—The ship *Mary Dugdale*, 400 tons, T. Harrison, Commander. Has the greater part of her cargo engaged, and will have immediate despatch. Apply to Messrs. W. Nicol and Co.—Rampart Row, 30th May, 1837.

FOR CHINA.—The *Edinburgh*, Captain Marshall, H. C. S., to sail about 1st July. For Freight or Passage Apply to Messrs. Macvicar Burn and Co.—Rampart Row, 29th May, 1837.

SALE BY AUCTION.—This day at 11 A. M. Messrs. FRITH AND CO. will sell by Public Auction, at his residence on the Mazagon Road, the valuable Household Furniture and Property, of WILLIAM FENWICK, Esq. proceeding to the Cape of Good Hope, Comprising Plate, Plated Ware, Glass, China, Porcelain, and Queen's Ware, Cutlery, a very handsome set of Mahogany Dining Tables, a Jackwood Sideboard, Tea Caddy, Jackwood Arm Chairs, Sugar Jars, Door Screens, Handsome Jackwood Couches, Foot Stools, and Arm Chairs, with Blue Silk damask Cushions to match, An excellent Grand Piano-forte, by "Broadwood," A very elegant Jackwood Book Case, with Wings, and Glass Doors, a Four light Argand Lamp, a Four light Chandelier, Double branch Wall-shades, 3 valuable Oil Paintings in rich Gilt Frames, Table Ornaments, a French Clock, Bedroom, Nursery and Dressing Room Furniture, a large quantity of nearly new Damask Table Linen, an Eight day Bracket Clock by "Barraud" goes remarkably well.

AT NOON.

A London-built Landauette, with Harness in good order, a Bengal built Shigram with Harness 2 Pair of excellent Carriage Horses, Tonjohn & Co. &c. &c.

The property will be on view from Saturday the 27th and following days.—Catalogues may be had on application to Frith and Co. at the premises, Nesbitt Lane, 30th May, 1837.

SALE BY AUCTION.—On Wednesday, the 7th Proximo. Messrs. Frith and Co. will submit for sale at their rooms at 11 A. M. the undermentioned viz. an invoice of "Brown's" Saddlery, an extensive assortment of Stationery, Long Cloth, Jacobets, Bengal Table Cloths and Napkins, Cotton Socks, colored Velvet, Violins, Accordeons and a Pipe of Madeira Wine.—Particulars will appear in future advertisements.—Nesbitt Lane, 29th May 1837.

ON SALE.—Imported per "Scourfield," Ind and Smiths, Pale Ale, of October Brew, and recommended to be superior any imported "this season" to this Market, Passes excepted, price 60 Rupees per caskhead, Cash, apply to THOS. JEFFERIES AND CO. Nesbitt Lane, 30th May, 1837.

EAST INDIA AGENCY IN LONDON FOR PASSENGERS. No. 11, Leadenhall street. Parties arriving in England, will, on immediate application to Mr. ALEXANDER, East India Passage Agent, No. 11, Leadenhall street (next door to the India House), secure the most prompt and speedy attention in regard to the clearing and forwarding of their baggage; engaging furnished apartments in town to prevent the expense of resorting to hotels; procuring immediate return engagements for native servants, and in all other matters consequent on a first arrival in London.

Publishing office of the "East India and Colonial Magazine, No. 11, Leadenhall street.—London, 25th Sept. 1836.

BILLSON Sir Charles Cockerell, Bart. and Co. London, in convenient sets, at 2s. 1d. 30 days' sight, may be had of MCGREGOR BROWNRIE, AND CO. Bombay, 30th May, 1837.

THE Agricultural and Horticultural Society of Western India, beg to intimate the arrival of their seasons supply of Vegetable, and flower seeds, from the Cape and England, a few Egyptian seeds are still on hand.

It would frequently prevent disappointment, if parties from outstations would be good enough, when sending their orders, to name their despatching Agents in Bombay, or mention how their parcels can be forwarded.

J. LITTLE, —Secretary. Bombay, 29th May, 1837.

N. B. "Letters on the business of the society" pass free within the limits of this presidency.

PANWELL TAVERN.—William Remington and Charles Jones beg to inform their friends and the public in general that a partnership has been formed between them, and that they will for the future conduct the "Panwell Tavern" under the firm of "Remington and Jones."

Travellers to and from Panwell will be supplied with all necessaries at the shortest notice, their Baggage, Cattle and servants will be either attended to, accommodated, or forwarded agreeably to directions, the accommodations and Cuisine will be the best the place can afford, and charges moderate.

In soliciting the public patronage Messrs. Remington and Jones beg to state that they will do all in their power to merit a continuance of its support.

Cards of particulars are in course of circulation.

TO be sold by public auction, on account of the Estates of the late Pestonjee Ruttonjee Patell, the following property.

On Tuesday, the 6th June next, a large dwelling House, with 2 adjoining Bungalows, &c., situated on the Duncan Road, opposite to the House of *Dorabjee Muncherjee Daroovala*, and assessed No. 62 and 45.

On Thursday, the 8th Do. Do. A large dwelling House in the Fort, in the Bazar Street, and assessed No. 12, belonging to *Bomanjee Byramjee Andiaroo*, and mortgaged to the late *Pestonjee Ruttonjee Patell*.

Conditions for sale, and other particulars may be made known on applying to DORABJEE PESTONJEE Administration of the late P. R. P.

SIXTIETH MADRAS GOVERNMENT LOTTERY SECOND CLASS, a few Tickets and shares in the above Lottery are for sale apply to *Byramjee Nesserwanjee Dantia*, at the office of Messrs. *Dirom Carter*, and Co.

At the following price viz.
Whole Tickets at Rs. 85 " " each
Half do. " 42 2 " "
Quarter do. " 21 1 " "

Terms Cash, Gentlemen are requested to include the amount of Postage in their remittances.

The drawing of the above Lottery will commence on the 8th June 1837.

N. B. Tickets and shares are renewable in the Second Class of the above Lottery and the holders thereof should renew them on or before the 11th of June next ensuing otherwise they will forfeit their claim in event of the said Tickets the being drawn prizes.—Bombay, 30th May 1837.

JUST PUBLISHED.—No XXVI. of the Quarterly Army List; corrected up to 30th April, 1837. Printed on Europe paper.—Price 3 Rupees.—Courier office, 27th May, 1837.

TO LET.—Entrance immediately *Briscoe Lodge*, Colaba, just vacated by Colonel *Baddeley* of the Bengal Army.—For particulars apply at Cowpers Cottage, directly opposite.

ON SALE.—At the Godowns of Messrs. HIGGINSON AND CARDWELL a small quantity of the following choice old Wines, Madeira in Hhds, quart, Casks, and 3 dozen cases, Sherry Pale and Brown, in Hhds and Port and Claret in 3 dozen cases.—Rampart Row, 30th May, 1837.

ON SALE.—At the Godowns of Messrs. HIGGINSON, & CARDWELL, a few Hhds of Bass's and Hodgson's Pale E. I. Ale of the October Brew.—Rampart Row, 30th May, 1837.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BOMBAY COURIER.
SIR.—As neither you nor your brother of the Gazette appear to have heard anything of a serious Cooly Rebellion which has risen, existed and been suppressed within the last 3 months in the Suburkanta. I will give you some account of it, although I am astonished that the latter personage should have been ignorant of it as the Suburkanta is nearer the Presidency than Deesa, from the Guard-room of which place he has lately given us so much important news.

On the 19th February a force consisting of a detachment of the 17th N. I. with a Howitzer and mortar were at Wuctapoor at the requisition of the Assistant Pol. Agent in the Miye Kanta who had called us there we understood with the view of ascertaining whether any of our Miye Kanta chiefs were engaged in an attack on the town of Aglore on the Saburmattee which had been carried on for the last six days by several thousand Coolies with the intention of reinstating the Thakoor of that place in his rights, of which in their opinion he had been unjustly deprived by the Guicowar some years ago.

On the 20th we marched to Aglore where we were met by some of the Sindee Garrison who informed us that the Coolies had only retired that morning on hearing of our approach, a fact considering that they outnumbered us by about 20 to one, not so much to be regretted as wondered at. The town was garrisoned by about 400 Sindees of whom 30 were killed or wounded during the 7 days fight and the surrounding ravines contained sundry heaps of defunct Coolies of whom probably 50 were placed horsed combat, The Thakoor of Paria a small village adjoining Aglore had turned traitor to the Sindees by whom he was supposed to be friendly, and by admitting the Coolies into his village had very nearly caused the loss of Aglore the first day, the Cooly leader Dowlat Sing having actually penetrated to the Sindee Durbur; when he found himself deserted by his men who had taken to plundering the town. After remaining here two or three days during which the Assistant Political Agent took measures to prevent our subjects from joining in the business, we left the place and for some time I heard little about the rebellion except that it was still progressing. On the 1st May however we were informed that it was determined to attack the town of Runseepoor next morning as about 260 Coolies had been sent to Paria at their head were located there and were working their way on to the Guicowar's villages in defiance of his army of Comovisars and Sindees, accordingly on the morning of the 2nd May at about sunrise the place was fully invested. On the Eastern bank of the Saburmattee which is there between 400 and 500 yards broad, facing the town was stationed a force consisting of 243 Howitzers, 1 Mortar, detachments of the 14th and 17th Regiment, Native Infantry, with a troop of the 1st Light Cavalry, North of the town on the west bank of the river was a Detachment of the 9th Native Infantry, with one mortar, and the west and south were occupied by the Guicowar's troops. The Political Agent on arriving met some of the inhabitants flying to the ravines, who in spite of his assurances of safety should they throw down their arms, ran back to the town and commenced firing, and the Assistant Political Agent having been fired on when he went near the town to attempt to parley, orders were given to the Artillery to open on it. After a few rounds the firing was checked and the Political Agent himself rode close to the town with the Commanding Officer of the Guicowar troops and again endeavoured to induce the insurgents to submit without more bloodshed; a volley of match locks was the only answer vouchsafed, which wounded a man standing close to them, so our firing was resumed, in half an hour the Sindees asked permission to give the assault which as the town was theirs, was granted, and after throwing a rocket or two at the town which hit the opposite bank of the river close to our troops, they advanced gallantly and after a sharp skirmish drove the Coolies out. These latter tried to escape a cross the bed of the river, where however they met our troops and still game to the backbone attempted to cut their way through. This of course was no use and a few minutes of the sword and bayonet well applied finished the affair. A few escaped up the river, 46 were taken prisoners and 77 bodies were found next day on the field: many others were of course removed by their friends during the night as we were encamped some distance from the spot, so altogether it was a pretty complete thing. The Guicowar's troops lost 7 killed and 29 wounded and our's one killed and 3 wounded. It was a most gallant affair on the part of the Coolies and there is little doubt that if left to themselves they would hold their own against all the Sindees in Guzerat. Even when surrounded by our troops* in the river they fought as long as they could stand, and one of them was shot in the act of cutting at the Pol. Agent who had just done the same favour to one of his companions. It is a wonder that more of us were not killed as not a musket was fired till just before the assault and the Coolies were liberal enough of their powder and shot in all directions. The Guicowar people took 10 prisoners among whom was the Thakoor of Paria above mentioned.

I know not how long this will look if you print it, but I know I am tired of writing it so no more at present from.
Your &c.
JOHN.

MILITARY ARRIVALS AND DEPARTURES.
ARRIVALS.
Cadet R. S. Wilson, from Persian Gulph.
Assist. Surgeon W. Sullivan, from Do. do.
Assist. Surgeon David Davies, from England.
Cadet Francis John Ford, from do.
Cadet James Lane Taylor from do.
Ditto Lewis Vardon, from do.
Ensign A. Aitcheson, 5th Regt. N. I. from Poonah.
Cadet N. J. Newham, from England.
Cadet Edgar Glennie, Infantry from do.

DEPARTURES.
Lieut. J. Tait, 6th Regt. N. I. to Surat.
Ensign Jas. Cahill, 24th Regt. N. I., to Baroda.

DOMESTIC OCCURRENCES.
DEATH.
At Ahmedabad, on the 21st Instant, Peter William

* We had about 350 of all arms.

McGregor, aged 7 months and 29 days son of P. Gray Esq. Assistant Surgeon.

SHIPPING ARRIVALS AND DEPARTURES.

ARRIVALS.
May 27th.—The East India Company's Steamer Hugh Lindsay, I. H. Rowband, Esq., Commander, from Bushire 17th May 1837 10 p. m.
Passengers.—Capt. Hawkins, I. N. Mr. Wilson, Cadet.
May 28th.—Schooner Emily, R. H. Child Master, from Cossier, 8th March, 1837.
Passengers.—Mr. A. D. Pron, Thos. Olliffe, Henry Blackhouse.
Do. Ship Ann, J. P. Griffith Master, from London, 8th Feb. 1837.
Passengers.—Miss Rooke, Miss G. Rooke, Miss Raneland, Mr. W. Grant, H. M. 4th Lt. Drgs. D. Davies, Assistant Surg. H. C. Service, Thos. Scott, J. L. Page, (E. Glennie, J. L. Taylor, J. Raneland, F. Ford, L. Vardon, N. J. Newham, Cadets) Robert Fowler, Mrs. Gordon.

DEPARTURES.
Do. 29th.—Ship Mount Stewart Elphinstone, A. Small, Master, to Port Glasgow.
Do.—Ship Isabella, I. Robertson, Master, to China.
Passenger.—Mr. Brown.

SHIPPING IN THE HARBOUR.

E. I. COMPANY'S VESSELS.—Receiving Hulk Hastings, Steamer Atalanta, Brig Tiptoe, Floating Chapel Aurora, Cutter Margaret and Steamer Hugh Lindsay.
FREE TRADERS.—Minerva, Pestonjee Bomanjee Briton, Vanguard, Mary Dugdale, Buckinghamshire, Lintin, Richard Walker, Palmira, Columbia, Slains Castle, Edinburgh, Ranger, Mary Bibby, Rapid, Northumberland, Argyle, Scourfield and Ann.
COUNTRY VESSELS.—Taufe, Lord Castlereagh, Charlotte, Earl of Balcarra, Lowjee Family, Glenelg, Hamudde, Edmonstone, Kusrovie, Charles Grant, Hind, Hulbaree, Harsinger, Dadaloy, Julia, Muhammad Ali Shaw Allum, Dowlett Savoy, Emily Jane, Discovery, Sir Herbert Compton, Indian Oakland Emily.
ARAB SHIP.—Taufe.
FRENCH.—Barque Anacreon.
STEAMER.—Indus.

THE COURIER.

TUESDAY 30th MAY, 1837.

The *Ann*, Captain Griffiths, arrived from London on Sunday afternoon in 90 days from Portsmouth. By her we have a few scattered papers including a number of the *Times* of the 22d February, from which we have extracted.

We hear from the authority, of letters received by the *Ann* upon which reliance may be placed, that the question of Steam Communication with India via the Red Sea, has been determined upon, that the British Government were to undertake the conveyance of Mails &c. to and from Alexandria, and that the East India Company were to undertake the conveyance on the Indian side,—the negotiations for this purpose between the Government and the Company had we understand been concluded, but we have not heard when operations were to commence.

We have received a Report of the proceedings of a General Meeting of the Agricultural and Horticultural Society of Western India, held at the Rooms of the Native Education Society on Friday last, but which from press of English matter we must defer until Saturday.

A supplement to the *Calcutta Gazette*, of the 17th instant contains the Draft of an act for effecting considerable alterations in the Post Office arrangements: for reduction of the rates of Inland Postage on letters, newspapers &c. and for the abolition of Private Dawks except upon license on certain conditions; we can only notice this at present, to state that it is directed that the Draft be brought up for reconsideration, at the first meeting of the Legislative Council, which may be held after the 16th of July next.

The *Berenice* was not to sail till the 25th March.

The arrival of the *Emily Yatch* on Sunday, from the Red Sea without the March Mail, has filled up our measure of disappointment as to the receipt of overland despatches, and this notwithstanding our Government. Notifications that provision had been, or was to be made, for those expected by the Red Sea, as well as those by the Persian Gulph. The mere chance of the last has been provided for, but the return is *nil*; the first, where there was an absolute certainty of some packet being found, has been left to a private opportunity, or rather to hap-hazard, and the result will be that the March and April Overland Mails will reach us, if at all, together with that of May, which a return Cruiser from the Red Sea may perhaps bring down, by which time they will in all probability have been superseded via the Cape.

It appears that the *Emily* left Cossier for Suez on the 8th March: sprung her main mast, and was compelled to bear away for Juddah where she arrived on the 11th, and from thence, on the 12th, the Master of her despatched a letter to Colonel Campbell at Alexandria, to signify that he was there and ready to wait and take the March Mail from Juddah to Bombay. He remained at Juddah until the 5th April, and then, having no reply from Colonel Campbell, and the Company's Native Agent there, not giving him an assurance that if he remained longer, he should have the preference if the Mail did arrive, he sailed from Juddah on the morning of the 5th April, in company with the H. C. Cruiser *Exrates*, and reached Goa leisurely with a cargo of passengers on the 20th inst. This on the face of it is a very lame and provoking account, and we think that after having written to Colonel Campbell, the least he might have done would have been to wait at Juddah, until there was a chance of the March Mail arriving there, which he must have known very well, could not have been by the 5th April. It appears however that he was under no stipulation to Government to bring back a packet: that it was left to his option to go to Suez or not, and that he was merely told that if he did bring back the Mail, a certain sum would be paid to him, and that if not, the *Palinurus* would bring it: in short that he had no particular reason or inducement to trouble his head about the matter. Now when we contrast this loose arrangement, or rather want of arrangement, with the exertions that have been made for the Syrian Route, we think we have a right to complain of a favoured scheme.

It has been said that all that has been done here as to the Syrian Route, was done in pursuance of peremptory directions from home by which our authorities were tied up: but if so, is it not most extraordinary, that not a single East India Director, as far as we can learn, should have availed himself in this instance of their own prescribed route, and the Court of Directors at least, if not the Public at large, must have been aware of the opportunity.

May it not therefore very fairly be inferred that some misapprehension has existed, and that, the Home Authorities did not expect, or calculate on such arrangements as have been made here: nor does the mere arrival of a despatch—an unimportant duplicate as it is ru-

March 1836, the House thought fit to follow up the

solution by a series of others,—which in effect were, that the Reports and Papers of the House should be sold at one half penny per sheet; that charts, &c., printed by order of the House, should be charged 3d. for each half-sheet; that the Papers then in store should be sold at the same rate as those of the then current session; that Messrs. Hansard, the printers of the House of Commons, should be appointed to print and conduct the sale of these Papers and Reports; and that an allowance of 12½ per cent. should be made to the trade. It was perfectly clear, then, that the defendants, in selling this Report, had acted under the order and authority of the House of Commons, and therefore were entitled to the privilege. Under the plea of "Not guilty," the first plea, the defendants were consequently entitled to a verdict.

Sir John Campbell quoted some cases in support of his argument.

Lord Denman then charged the Jury, as follows.

"Two points arise on the first issue, that of 'not guilty,' and they are—first, whether the defendants published the report in question; and secondly, whether it is a libel. If you think that the book published by the plaintiff does deserve the description given of it in the publication of the defendants, you will find a verdict in their favour; for if a man has really published a disgusting book, with indecent and obscene plates, he ought not to complain of any one stating that he had done so; and you will probably think that in such a case such a statement ought not to be made the subject of an action. That ground of defence is not, however, one which has been taken up by the Attorney General: he admits that the publication of such a work would be immoral and improper, and, consequently, that it imputes to a man that he had published it would if the making of such imputation was not privileged, subject the person who made it to an action. The questions which I shall leave to you upon the general issue are—first, whether the publication now complained of was made by the defendants; and secondly, if so, whether that publication is libellous. On the third ground which has been submitted to you, namely, that this is a privileged publication, I am bound to say, (as it comes before me as a question of law for my direction,) I entirely disagree from the law laid down by this learned counsel for the defendants. I am not aware of the existence in this country of any body whatever which can privilege any servant of theirs to publish libels on any individual. Whatever arrangements may be made between the House of Commons and any publishers whom they may employ, I am of opinion that the person who publishes in it in his public shop, and specially for money, which can be injurious and possibly ruinous to any one of his Majesty's subjects, must answer in a court of justice to that subject, if he challenges him for that libel. I wish to say so emphatically and distinctly, because I think, if on the first opportunity that arose in a court of justice on such a question that point were to be left unsatisfactorily explained, the Judge who sat there might become an accomplice in the destruction of the liberties of his country, and expose every individual who lived in it to a tyranny no man ought to submit to. I think the case quoted on that subject is not applicable to the present. It does not go the whole length; and it seems to me that it is not in any respect capable of being urged as an authority to prevent my going the length I have just now stated. Therefore, my direction to you, subject to question hereafter, is, that the fact of the House of Commons having directed Messrs. Hansard to publish all their Parliamentary Reports and Papers, is no justification for them, or any bookseller who publishes a Parliamentary Report containing a libel against any man. If you think that the book referred to is 'disgusting, and the plates obscene and indecent,' then the defendants are entitled to your verdict; or whether the book was merely a scientific exposition of a subject, which, for the benefit of mankind, must be explained and discussed in scientific works, and whether it was or was not deserving of the strong epithets applied to it by the Inspectors in their Report. Supposing you should think that those epithets are not borne out by the character and nature of the book itself, you will find a verdict for the plaintiff; and then, in the next place, you will have to say what amount of damages he is entitled to by reason of such publication. It would be at once absurd and ridiculous to impute to these defendants any motive of a malicious nature towards the plaintiff; but, nevertheless, if the result of the publication has been to inflict an injury on the plaintiff, and if they have not satisfied you that the publication is no libel, or that the publication of it is justifiable, they must answer to him in damages. There is no imputation justly resting on the motives of the Inspectors, or of the Secretary of State; but I must observe, it seems to me that there has been a want of caution in preparing this Report; for I do not see why there was any necessity to publish the names of the particular books found in possession of the prisoners. The plaintiff, however, says that he has suffered a great loss in consequence of the statement contained in the Report; but he has not proved what situation or what trade of his has been injured by the publication. All these matters you will take into your consideration. If you think that the defendants have published a libel, you will find for the plaintiff on the first issue, and give him such damages as you consider the case requires; but though you may regard the publication as being libellous, still, if you think that the remark made on the plaintiff's book is justified by the nature of that book, you will find a verdict for the defendants on that issue; and if you do, as the justification will then have been made out, that justification will be an answer to the plaintiff's claim for damages."

The Jury retired; and, after some consideration, brought in a verdict for the plaintiff on the first issue; and for the defendants on the second, declaring their opinion that the book was disgusting, obscene, and indecent.

The resignation of Mr. Justice Gaslee is announced; and Sir Robert Rolfe, the Solicitor-General, is mentioned as his probable successor—Sir John Campbell aiming at higher game than a Puisne Judgeship. But if Sir Robert Rolfe ascend to the bench, there will be a vacancy in Penryn and Falmouth, which may be filled by a Tory. This is unpleasant. Sergeant Wilde is talked of as the new Solicitor-General; but his elevation would create a vacancy in Newark, and that would be unpleasant also.

We can now state, upon authority, that the Duke of Roxburghe, has avowed himself a decided friend to the Liberal cause.—*Kelso Chronicle*. [The promise of an English Barony is said to have decided his Grace.]

Lord Ranelagh has got himself into a disagreeable scrape. He has been writing letters to Lord John Hay, to assure his Lordship that he was not aware that his Majesty's forces were actively employed in the defence of Bilbao; but Lord John, in the following passage of his reply to Ranelagh, makes it pretty evident that his Lordship and Corresponding Lordship must have known against whom he was fighting—

"I have to acquaint you, that I received information that several British subjects, amongst whom your Lordship was named, were acting with the insurgent army during the late siege of Bilbao and the operations on the banks of the Nervion. Those operations lasted several weeks, and during the whole of which period, six vessels belonging to his Majesty's squadron, and many boats, with their flags, always displayed, were actively and prominently engaged in co-operating with her Catholic Majesty's forces against the insurgents, for the relief of Bilbao and the protection of the persons and property of British subjects who were in the neighbourhood of the town. It is therefore my duty to direct the senior officer in command of his Majesty's ship stationed in that river, to take every measure to the authenticity of such reports."

Edward, second Marquis of Drogheda, aged sixty-eight, died on Monday, at Greatford, where he had laboured under mental affliction for forty-five years. In early life, his Lordship, then Lord Moore, was a Member of the Irish House of Commons, and held a commission in his father's regiment, the Eighteenth Light Dragoons. He dying a bachelor, his titles and estates devolved upon his nephew, the only child of the late Lord Henry Moore and Miss Parnell, daughter of Sir H. Parnell, now in his thirteenth year.—*Boston Herald*.

The Foreign intelligence received this morning consists chiefly of rumours. It is plain that matters are in a very uneasy state in France. The Court party use threatening language, and declare that Louis Phillip is prepared for a coup d'Etat, which will not fail when he directs it. There are symptoms of a renewal of the connexion of Thiers with the King; and the insubordination of the army renders the accession of Louis to the Government absolutely necessary, in the opinion of many persons of influence.

CLAUSEL, mistaking Charles Dupin for the President of the Chamber of Deputies, wrote a letter to the former, calling him to account for certain reflections on the African expedition made by the President in his speech to Louis Phillip on the first day of the year. The President has replied to Clausel in tranchant style. Among other remarks, he says that Algiers, that woful legacy of the Restoration, has already cost France 200,000,000 francs, (8,000,000*l.* sterling,) besides the lives of thousands.

The quarterly average of the weekly liabilities and assets of the Bank of England, from 15th November 1836 to 7th February 1837, is as follows.

LIABILITIES. ASSETS.

Circulation... £ 7,868,000 Securities... £31,085,000

Deposits... 14,230,000 Bullion... 4,034,000

£32,098,000 £35,117,000

From a comparison of this statement with that published on the 13th of January, it appears that the circulation has been increased by 446,000*l.*; the deposits diminished by 124,000*l.*; the securities increased by 720,000*l.*; and the bullion diminished by 255,000*l.*

The House of Commons was principally occupied last night with a Bill introduced by Mr. Hume, for placing the financial affairs of Counties under the control of Boards to be elected annually by the rate-payers. Mr. Hume proposes that these Boards shall consist of from twelve to twenty-four persons, according to the size of the counties; that the rate-payers shall elect auditors, in the same way as the members of the Board; that Commissioners shall be appointed to divide the counties into electoral districts, the divisional districts or unions made by the Poor-law Commissioners to be adopted when no especial inconvenience would arise from so doing; and that every officer acting under the Boards shall be paid by salary and not by fees.

Sir EARDLEY WILMOT, an experienced Magistrate, was disposed to give the bill a trial; and suggested, that it should be confined in its operation to Middlesex alone for one year. He admitted that it was desirable, in order to free the Magistracy from suspicion, that some arrangement should be made for a public and responsible management of the county finances, though this was a part of the business best attended to by the Magistrates.

The business discharged by Magistrates at the Sessions was first to look to the county expenditure, then the civil business, and lastly the judicial duties. On the first day, or a portion of the first day, when the county expenditure was to be considered, there was a large attendance of Magistrates. On the second day, when the appeals were to be determined,—and he was present when most important appeals were discussed,—he could procure but the assistance of four or five Magistrates; and he was often obliged to sit with hardly a board at all; but at the time the judicial duties were to be discharged, it was difficult to get a second Magistrate to attend.

Sir EARDLEY WILMOT here "let the cat out of the bag." The "county expenditure" means jobbing; as almost every Magistrate has a nice little job of his own to forward, there is a full attendance on the first day. When attention is required and no profit to be made, scarcely a man can be prevailed upon to stay on the bench. Oh, the disinterestedness of an "Unpaid Magistracy!" The difficulty of getting a sufficient number of Magistrates to attend to the criminal business, induced Sir Eardley Wilmot to propose that the law should be administered in counties as in towns, by Recorders.

Captain Pechell told the House, that when the gentlemen in the county-town and its neighbourhood were hospitable, then there was no lack of Magistrates at Quarter-sessions; but where they shut their doors, the attendance was scanty. Another compliment this to the "Unpaid Magistracy!"

LORD JOHN RUSSELL gave a general support to Mr. Hume's bill; and observed, that some regular system for the appointment of Magistrates would be desirable. Now it lay with the Lord-Lieutenants to select whom they pleased; and some of them excluded clergymen, while others preferred them. For his part, he objected to see clergymen on the bench.

The Tories dislike this bill exceedingly. Colonel Sibthorpe said, that the bill was of a dangerous and democratic tendency, and went to increase the lowest body of Commissioners. Colonel Wood will "decidedly oppose it." Mr. A. Chapman considers it a measure "degrading to the Magistracy, subversive of society, and an encroachment on the privileges of the Crown!" Mr. Arthur Trevor reproaches the measure "as *ab ovo usque ad finem*." Mr. Richards is surprised, that when doubt perplexity, and alarm reign in this great city, Mr. Hume can allow his mind to be diverted from vast questions to so trivial a matter: nothing but the spirit of party could have had such influence upon him.

The end of the matter was, that Mr. Hume had leave to bring in his bill. Now let us see the author, and his Ministerial allies on this occasion, stand firmly up to every particular point in the plan against which no conclusive reason shall be brought, and yield not one inch in the miserable spirit of lacy and cowardly compromise.

Mr. Hume then introduced another useful measure, for lessening the Expenses of Elections. The only opposition he encountered was from the gallant and profuse Colonel Sibthorpe, who seems to have been in great force last night. He protested against the bill, as calculated to put a stop to "old English hospitality"—that is, treating and debauchery of electors. But the Colonel declares that it shall not interfere with his liberality. He likes to live with his people and is people like to live with him; and if Mr. Hume will only go to the Colonel's "place" in Lincolnshire, the Colonel is certain that he would abandon his bill—such would be the excellent effect of the "hospitality" he would there receive and witness.

The Leasing-making, the Court of Session, and the Small Debts, Court Bill, read a second time; as was also the English Recorders Courts Bill, the object of which is to allow a Recorder to appoint a Deputy.

The Irish Grand Juries Bill went through the Committee and was reported.

Numerous petitions were presented. Among these were—

One from Brighton, by Captain Pechell, relative to the

fishery on the coast of France, and the outrages of the French upon the English fishermen. At the suggestion of Mr. Charles Wood, the facts of the petition will be laid before the Admiralty Board in the shape of memorial.

A petition from Ludlow, detailing the tricks of the old Corporation to prevent the new Council from obtaining possession of the Town property was presented by Mr. Blackburne; who wished it to be referred to the Privilege Committee now sitting on Mr. Charlton's case; but as the petition did not complain of a breach of privilege the Speaker objected to this course.

Some important questions were he asked and answered. In reply to Mr. French, Lord Morpeth said that Ministers were anxiously considering the means of preventing the anticipated scarcity of food on the North-west coast of Ireland.

LORD JOHN RUSSELL informed Lord Stanley, that he intended to move for a Committee of inquiry into the working of the Education system in Ireland. He did not intend to include Mayo; though he believed that an inquiry into that institution would prove that an increase of the grant was desirable. Mr. O'Connell said the people of Ireland would prefer having no grant at all.

Among the notices of motions, were the following. By Mr. DIVER, that he should move the suspension of the writ for Stafford on Monday; when Captain Chetwynd will move that a new writ be issued.

The part of the King's Speech relating to Irish Poor-laws having been read by the Clerk, on the motion of Lord John Russell, Lord John gave notice, that on Monday next he should call the attention of the House to that part of the Speech.

Mr. HARVEY to move, on the 14th of April, for a Select Committee to inquire into the natural and extent of every branch and every kind of Revenue exclusively enjoyed or appropriated by the Crown, with a view to a wise economy in any future arrangement of the Civil List.

THE ONLY great measure which the Government has the slightest chance of carrying during the present session—the Irish Poor-law—was brought forward in the House of Commons on Monday, by Lord John Russell. The leading provisions of the bill were correctly stated in the *Speaker*, a fortnight ago; but it will be as well to repeat them, with details not then specified.

The English Poor-law Commissioners, with the prospective addition of one member to their Board, are to form in Ireland unions of districts, without regarding civil or ecclesiastical boundaries, as they may see occasion. In each of the unions—which are to be twenty miles square, giving an area of 400 miles to each—is to be erected a workhouse, capable of holding 800 persons. It is calculated that there will be 100 unions, and 100 workhouses, when the plan comes fully into operation; there will therefore be accommodation for 80,000 persons. No relief is to be given out of the workhouse, and only in the workhouse to the *desistute*, whether able-bodied or helpless. There is to be no law of settlement. The estimated cost of the workhouses is 700,000*l.*, and the expense of each pauper eightpence a week. There is to be a Board of Guardians in every union, composed exclusively of laymen, subordinate to the Commissioners; and to be elected in the first instance by the County Cess payers, afterwards by the Poor-rate payers. The rate is to be levied half on the tenant and half on the landlord, the former to deduct his payment from his rent; but the occupier of land or buildings under 5*l.* a year is not to be liable to the rate—there the landlord only is to pay.

It is intended to give some slight assistance to persons wishing to emigrate; but the Poor-law contains no provisions as to emigration—and of course none as to public works.

The measure was explained to the House in an able speech by Lord John Russell, and received the attention it deserved from the leading men on both sides. It seemed to be taken for granted that a Poor-law for Ireland must be passed this session. The difficulties which may impede, if not prevent, the practical operation of the Government plan, were forcibly pointed out by Mr. O'Connell and Lord Stanley; but both pleaded themselves to do their utmost to improve it. Mr. O'Connell said emphatically, "Whether efficient or not, a Poor-law we must have." It is plain that he does not expect the present measure to be efficient; but now that the necessity of a Poor-law for Ireland is universally admitted, and that legislation towards it is about to commence, it will be easier afterwards to carry a measure of greater efficiency than this mere beginning.

Sir ROBERT PEEL endeavoured to damage the bill, while professing a general approval of it. His comments were not made in the spirit of one who really rejoiced that so great a step had been taken towards the civilization of Ireland. Sir Robert never forgot that he was leader of the Opposition. Lord Stanley yielded to the impulses of a more generous nature; none who heard him could doubt his sincerity in promising to the Ministers every assistance in perfecting their scheme; and, judging from the knowledge of the subject he displayed we can believe that his aid will not be useless.

LORD JOHN RUSSELL has also reproduced that miserable abortion of Bishop Blomfield, the Pluralities Bill. Mr. Hume has given him timely notice this session, at all events, that it would meet with sturdy opposition. The measure is in every material part the same as that which was scouted last year. We trust that it will never be allowed to pass the House of Commons. Every Parliamentary mode of hostility should be used against it. If Lord John Russell and his colleagues are content to be the humble tools of a Tory Bishop, let not the Independent Reformers degrade themselves by assisting in the dirty work. What can possess these Whig Ministers? Would Peel or Wellington father the unpopular offspring of Dr. Matlib's ambition? If the measure were agreeable to any large body of men in the country, there would be a motive and a reason for taking it up, bad as it is. But the great body of the Clergy, as well as all pious laymen, must dislike it; the Dissenters have neither part nor lot in it; a majority of the Liberal Members of the House of Commons are resolved, if possible, to strangle it. Whom then will it gratify? The Bishop of London—perhaps the most unpopular man in England! When will the Home Secretary incur such obloquy to serve his friends?

The Independent Reformers put their new policy into action for the first time on Tuesday. Sir William Molesworth moved to repeal the Acts which require Members of Parliament to be possessed of 600*l.* a year if for Counties, and 300*l.* a year if for Boroughs, in landed property. The arguments by which Sir William Molesworth, Mr. Leader, Mr. Ewart, and Mr. O'Connell, supported the motion will appear from a dissection of those with which it was resisted.

It was urged by Mr. Arthur Trevor and Mr. Maclean that the property qualification alone kept persons of the "lower orders"—the "canaille"—out of the House of Commons. To this the brief and sufficient reply is that notoriously, the Qualification Acts are evaded by a very large number of Members. Very few persons indeed are prevented from obtaining a seat in Parliament by the want of a qualification. They are manufactured by dozens on the eve of election; and the only known instance in recent times of the want of a qualification being used as a reason for not going into Parliament is that of Dr. Southey; who was glad of the excuse to escape a duty to which he was disinclined. The reason alleged by Mr. Maclean and Mr. Trevor for keeping the Qualification Acts on the Statute-book is therefore utterly worthless; since the enactments

do not answer the purpose for which alone those gentlemen value them.

But their defence of them proceeds altogether upon a false principle. The Tory framers of these laws, in the reign of Queen Anne, had the design of maintaining the predominance of the landed interest. They desired to bolster up the country gentlemen against the growing power of the mercantile classes; but it does appear that they considered property as the test of fitness to present the people. Such, however, is in effect the argument of the modern Tories. A man may be intelligent well-instructed, active, eloquent, industrious and the unanimous choice of his fellow citizens; but all this availed him nothing unless he has so much a year. Such is the basis on which the Tories build their opposition of the motion of Sir William Molesworth.

But, it may be said, it is some guarantee of respectability at any rate, that a person is able to procure even a fictitious qualification. Let the list of those who voted against the motion be scanned, and it will be seen that the ability to procure a fictitious qualification is not the slightest surety for respectability of character. On the other hand, let the list of Scotch Members be examined, and it will be found that the electors do not need the Qualification Acts to enable them to select men of respectability and fortune for their Representatives. In fact, nothing can be more contrary to experience than the notion that, if left free to choose whom they please, the people would generally elect men of broken-down fortunes or dependent means to represent them in Parliament. Be that as it may, the principle of our representative system is *free choice* by the electors; and any law which tends to curtail and restrict that choice is a violation of the principle. If the electors would choose a different class of persons from those who are now in the House, and are prevented by the Qualification Acts, then those acts impede the working of the representative system, and the existing House of Commons usurps an unconstitutional authority.

LORD FRANCIS EGERTON took up a different ground of opposition to the motion. He said that if the property qualification of the Members were abolished, it followed as a corollary that the property qualification of the Electors also must be done away with. We do not feel the force of this argument. Unless we go as far as universal suffrage which in the strict sense of the word, prevails now here, not even in the most democratic states of America—we must have some simple test of fitness to exercise the elective franchise. If it were possible to examine and decide upon the intellectual and moral character of each elector—if we could weed out of the mass the foolish and the depraved—then, beyond all doubt, wisdom and virtue should be the qualifications required from an election. But, in the case of the constituencies, it is not practicable to make the selection—we cannot apply the best tests. The case is different altogether as respects the candidate. He stands out from among the crowd; he is a marked man: instead of thousands, we have only an individual to deal with; his capacity may be measured—his moral fitness scrutinized. In his case the vulgar test may be discarded and the best one applied; there is no need for him to produce his rent-roll, as he should not be elected for his wealth but for the possession of more appropriate qualities. Does not Lord Francis Egerton see that if he throw aside fanciful analogies and take a common-sense view of the subject there may be excellent reasons for retaining the qualification in the case of the Elector and abolishing it as regards the Member?

It grieves us to say what a shabby figure Lord John Russell cut in this discussion. He admitted all that the supporters of the motion insisted upon; he allowed that no danger would arise from abolishing the qualification—that the People might be safely left to the free choice of their Representatives—that the existing system led to disgraceful frauds and evasions of the law; and yet, after having privately signified his intention to vote for the motion he voted against it,—professing his willingness to amend the law; thus as a Member remarked in words memorable for their truth and point "winding his way between right and wrong." Sir William Molesworth would not yield to the Leader's solicitations, though backed by those of the Liberal Lord Ebrington and the Radical Mr. Warburton. He would not be the instrument of improving or glossing a law bad in principle well knowing that the best method of preserving a nuisance is to abate it only in part.

A division took place; and the motion was rejected, by 133 to 104. But of whom was the majority composed? There were of

Tories... 98

Trimmers... 7

Whigs... 16

Ministers and their employes... 12

133

To the minority of 104, add the unsalaried Whigs of the majority, 16—120. Thus it appears, that of 120 Liberals in the House, 104 voted with Sir William Molesworth and 16 with the Minister. Lord John Russell was beaten by a *Reform* majority of six to one.

Sir JOHN CAMERON and Mr. J. A. Murray, notwithstanding their offices, honourably and wisely voted with the minority,—well remembering the burst of indignation from Scotland, when, in the days of the Reform Bill, it was attempted to impose the property qualification on Scotch Members. Mr. Fox Maule followed the Home Secretary: if he had remembered as freshly as his countrymen, Campbell and Murray, the doings of 1832, he would have paused to ask himself, whether a vote for rivetting on Englishmen fetters from which Scotchmen are free, was the best preparation for his approaching encounter with "the hater of all Reform" in Perthshire.

By way of covering the disgraceful defeat of Ministers, Mr. Warburton has given notice of a motion to amend the Qualification-laws. If he think better of it, Mr. Warburton may find more useful employment. Being a sound logician, he ought to know that the case made out, and which he properly supported by his vote, was a case for abolition, not for patching and mending. Men of talent, knowledge, and principle, are not so over-abundant in the House of Commons, in proportion to the labours demanding stout workmen, as to justify any Member, who possesses these requisites, in wasting his energies upon the infinitely little.

The first movement of the Independent Reformers has been attended with encouraging success. What will those gentlemen who prophesied that Sir William Molesworth and his more ardent friends would be isolated in their course of independent action, and who endeavoured to cut them off from the main body of the Reformers, say to Tuesday night's division? Let them recur again and again to the numbers,—for Sir William Molesworth, 104; for Lord John Russell, Home Secretary, Cabinet Minister, and Leader of the House of Commons, 16!

Another attempt was made, on Thursday—unsuccessfully of course—to procure a vote of the House of Commons for the removal of the Bishops from Parliament. Mr. Charles Lushington led the assault on the Right Reverend Bench, seconded by Messrs. Hume, Ewart, and Charles Buller Lord John Russell and Sir Robert Peel, Charles Buller Lord John Russell and Sir Robert Peel, though feeble in argument, proved strong in numbers; an I the resolution which declared the sitting of the Bishops in the Upper House to be hostile to the interests of Religion and the Church, and disagreeable to the People, was rejected by a Tory Whig majority of 107 to 92.

LORD JOHN RUSSELL's main argument against the motion was, that would destroy, not reform, an essential part of the Constitution, and he was not prepared to go that length. If the connexion of the Church with the State was to endure, clergymen must be admitted to the Legislature.

do not answer the purpose for which alone those gentlemen value them.

But their defence of them proceeds altogether upon a false principle. The Tory framers of these laws, in the reign of Queen Anne, had the design of maintaining the predominance of the landed interest. They desired to bolster up the country gentlemen against the growing power of the mercantile classes; but it does appear that they considered property as the test of fitness to present the people. Such, however, is in effect the argument of the modern Tories. A man may be intelligent well-instructed, active, eloquent, industrious and the unanimous choice of his fellow citizens; but all this availed him nothing unless he has so much a year. Such is the basis on which the Tories build their opposition of the motion of Sir William Molesworth.

But, it may be said, it is some guarantee of respectability at any rate, that a person is able to procure even a fictitious qualification. Let the list of those who voted against the motion be scanned, and it will be seen that the ability to procure a fictitious qualification is not the slightest surety for respectability of character. On the other hand, let the list of Scotch Members be examined, and it will be found that the electors do not need the Qualification Acts to enable them to select men of respectability and fortune for their Representatives. In fact, nothing can be more contrary to experience than the notion that, if left free to choose whom they please, the people would generally elect men of broken-down fortunes or dependent means to represent them in Parliament. Be that as it may, the principle of our representative system is *free choice* by the electors; and any law which tends to curtail and restrict that choice is a violation of the principle. If the electors would choose a different class of persons from those who are now in the House, and are prevented by the Qualification Acts, then those acts impede the working of the representative system, and the existing House of Commons usurps an unconstitutional authority.

LORD FRANCIS EGERTON took up a different ground of opposition to the motion. He said that if the property qualification of the Members were abolished, it followed as a corollary that the property qualification of the Electors also must be done away with. We do not feel the force of this argument. Unless we go as far as universal suffrage which in the strict sense of the word, prevails now here, not even in the most democratic states of America—we must have some simple test of fitness to exercise the elective franchise. If it were possible to examine and decide upon the intellectual and moral character of each elector—if we could weed out of the mass the foolish and the depraved—then, beyond all doubt, wisdom and virtue should be the qualifications required from an election. But, in the case of the constituencies, it is not practicable to make the selection—we cannot apply the best tests. The case is different altogether as respects the candidate. He stands out from among the crowd; he is a marked man: instead of thousands, we have only an individual to deal with; his capacity may be measured—his moral fitness scrutinized. In his case the vulgar test may be discarded and the best one applied; there is no need for him to produce his rent-roll, as he should not be elected for his wealth but for the possession of more appropriate qualities. Does not Lord Francis Egerton see that if he throw aside fanciful analogies and take a common-sense view of the subject there may be excellent reasons for retaining the qualification in the case of the Elector and abolishing it as regards the Member?

It grieves us to say what a shabby figure Lord John Russell cut in this discussion. He admitted all that the supporters of the motion insisted upon; he allowed that no danger would arise from abolishing the qualification—that the People might be safely left to the free choice of their Representatives—that the existing system led to disgraceful frauds and evasions of the law; and yet, after having privately signified his intention to vote for the motion he voted against it,—professing his willingness to amend the law; thus as a Member remarked in words memorable for their truth and point "winding his way between right and wrong." Sir William Molesworth would not yield to the Leader's solicitations, though backed by those of the Liberal Lord Ebrington and the Radical Mr. Warburton. He would not be the instrument of improving or glossing a law bad in principle well knowing that the best method of preserving a nuisance is to abate it only in part.

A division took place; and the motion was rejected, by 133 to 104. But of whom was the majority composed? There were of

Tories... 98

Trimmers... 7

Whigs... 16

Ministers and their employes... 12

133

To the minority of 104, add the unsalaried Whigs of the majority, 16—120. Thus it appears, that of 120 Liberals in the House, 104 voted with Sir William Molesworth and 16 with the Minister. Lord John Russell was beaten by a *Reform* majority of six to one.

Sir JOHN CAMERON and Mr. J. A. Murray, notwithstanding their offices, honourably and wisely voted with the minority,—well remembering the burst of indignation from Scotland, when, in the days of the Reform Bill, it was attempted to impose the property qualification on Scotch Members. Mr. Fox Maule followed the Home Secretary: if he had remembered as freshly as his countrymen, Campbell and Murray, the doings of 1832, he would have paused to ask himself, whether a vote for rivetting on Englishmen fetters from which Scotchmen are free, was the best preparation for his approaching encounter with "the hater of all Reform" in Perthshire.

By way of covering the disgraceful defeat of Ministers, Mr. Warburton has given notice of a motion to amend the Qualification-laws. If he think better of it, Mr. Warburton may find more useful employment. Being a sound logician, he ought to know that the case made out, and which he properly supported by his vote, was a case for abolition, not for patching and mending. Men of talent, knowledge, and principle, are not so over-abundant in the House of Commons, in proportion to the labours demanding stout workmen, as to justify any Member, who possesses these requisites, in wasting his energies upon the infinitely little.

The first movement of the Independent Reformers has been attended with encouraging success. What will those gentlemen who prophesied that Sir William Molesworth and his more ardent friends would be isolated in their course of independent action, and who endeavoured to cut them off from the main body of the Reformers, say to Tuesday night's division? Let them recur again and again to the numbers,—for Sir William Molesworth, 104; for Lord John Russell, Home Secretary, Cabinet Minister, and Leader of the House of Commons, 16!

Another attempt was made, on Thursday—unsuccessfully of course—to procure a vote of the House of Commons for the removal of the Bishops from Parliament. Mr. Charles Lushington led the assault on the Right Reverend Bench, seconded by Messrs. Hume, Ewart, and Charles Buller Lord John Russell and Sir Robert Peel, Charles Buller Lord John Russell and Sir Robert Peel, though feeble in argument, proved strong in numbers; an I the resolution which declared the sitting of the Bishops in the Upper House to be hostile to the interests of Religion and the Church, and disagreeable to the People, was rejected by a Tory Whig majority of 107 to 92.

LORD JOHN RUSSELL's main argument against the motion was, that would destroy, not reform, an essential part of the Constitution, and he was not prepared to go that length. If the connexion of the Church with the State was to endure, clergymen must be admitted to the Legislature.

lature; and precedents and illustrations drawn from countries where the alliance between Church and State was not as in England, were not to the purpose when addressed to a British Parliament. If, said Lord John, you expel Bishops from the House of Peers, you must admit clergymen into the House of Commons. We are ready to accept the alternative; we would allow all persons to be eligible to a seat in the Legislature by their fellowcitizens. Few clergymen, however, would find their way into the House of Commons, as they would, in general, be considered not the best qualified for the performance of legislative functions. But it does not follow that the connexion between Church and State would be dissolved by turning the Bishops out of the House of Peers, even though clergymen should continue to be excluded from the House of Commons. That alliance might be preserved in England, as in Scotland, by the appointment of a Lord High Commissioner to preside in a General Assembly of the Clergy. Other effectual modes might easily be devised—supposing it predetermined that Church and State alliance shall always be the *sine qua non*, and the reality of religion sacrificed to a name and a pretence. The question therefore is not whether the Church and State are to continue in connexion, but whether the present mode of preserving that connexion by taking Bishops from their special spiritual duties, to make them bad politicians and mischievous partisans, is the best. Supposing the interests of Religion and those of the Establishment identical, the existing system is injurious to both. It is merely servicable to a few ecclesiastical grandees and to the Ministers who job in bishoprics. The arguments of Lord John Russell then, are reduced to this—that the change proposed in an infringement on an old evil custom. This plea may pass in Parliament for some time longer; but it is already out of vogue in the country—the majority of the people have no great reverence for any thing merely because it has existed for centuries. Utility, not antiquity, is valuable; and the Bishops in the House of Peers are useless for any good purpose, though the workers of much wrong.

It was amusing to witness the swelling self-importance with which Sir Robert Peel came forward to aid Lord John, and to "share the unpopularity" of resisting the motion. How could he lose popularity by opposing it? He was acting with his friends and his party, who expected no less from him. To have supported the motion would have damaged him. Poor Lord John Russell was the magnanimous person, for he sacrificed himself for his enemies; he blessed them that curse him, and fondled those who would gladly sting him to death. Yet Peel, forsooth, must come forward and make a fuss about this generous disinterestedness!

The Division-lists on this question also prove that Lord John Russell was opposed by a majority of the Liberals, and that he defeated his own friends by the aid of the Tories. The majority of 197 may be thus analyzed—

Liberals	34
Ministers	7
Trimmers	10
Tories	146

197

The Ministerial force in the majority was only 41. The Independent Reformers numbered 92. On this division, then, Lord John Russell was supported by only about one-third of the Liberals in the House, with all the assistance of his salaried colleagues. How many more exhibitions of a similar character will he submit to? When will his Lordship again go out in sweet companionship with Peter Borthwick to vote against a majority of his own supporters?

Bribery and corruption triumph at Stafford. The House of Commons decided on Monday, by a vote of 152 to 151, that the long-suspended writ should be issued. The majority was composed of 150 Tories, with Mr. Buckingham and Mr. Tulk, who on this occasion thought proper to walk over to the enemy, Sir John Hobhouse, on the other hand, walked out of the House, to avoid the disagreeable necessity of opposing his colleagues, or, we suppose, violating his conscientious feelings, Sir John, it would seem, believes that the present constituency of Stafford is qualified to exercise electoral rights. We have no doubt they will justify his good opinion, by reelecting the standard of corruption, and selling their votes at higher prices than ever. And who can blame them? Have not both Houses of Parliament sanctioned the bribery of the Stafford electors? Arraigned at the bar, have they not been acquitted, with an implied advice to persevere in their past courses?

It is very true that other places may be almost (not quite) as corrupt as Stafford; and it is also certain, as Mr. Roebuck stated, that the best cure of bribery is to be found in an extension of suffrage and the secret vote; but that does not justify the acquittal of an offender whose guilt has been established. Because we cannot punish all, must those escape whom we have in our power! If the question had been—"Shall proceedings be commenced against Stafford, on account of its notorious corruption?"—it might have been plausibly alleged that bribery was so general that it was not worth while to elect this particular borough for an example. But the first step has been taken, and a case of enormous corruption actually proved against Stafford. The sympathetic Lords saved the sinners last year, for reasons not to be named; and this year the conforming Commons stultify their former proceedings because the Tory Whippers-in had been active in the morning while the Liberal leaders dozed in dignified apathy. But the matter is settled. The Tories have gained the day. An assurance has been given to all the boroughs in the country, that though they reek with bribery and debauchery, not a voter shall be touched, and they may sin in safety. Now then, gentlemen, be ye Whig or Tories, send down your candidate to Stafford. The place is for sale—success to the highest bidder! We bet, however, on the Tory.

Questions of privilege have recently engaged much of the attention of the House of Commons—more, indeed, than there has been any great occasion for. The Honourable House has thought it necessary to deal with the dictum of a Judge, which led to no practical consequences, as though it had been a most formidable assault. In charging the Jury, last week, in the case of Hansard and Stockdale, Lord Denman laid it down as the law of the land, that the authority of Parliament could not justify any body in publishing libels. But the Jury, in that case, found that the publication in question was justified by its truth. Thus, Lord Denman's exhibition of scrupulous regard for the rights of the subject would have led to nothing, if the House had not, moved by the plaint of its printer, taken the alarm at an abstraction. One of the achievements of the week has been to appoint a Select Committee to search for precedents to make out the title of the House to authorize the publication of libels. In candour we must own that another point is involved—the "judge-made law" bears not only against libel, but against truth, and all free Parliamentary discussion.

Mr. LECHMERE CHARLTON remains in limbo. Great efforts were made to procure a vote of the Committee of Privileges in his favour. But his friends, finding themselves in the minority, acquiesced in a report, delivered to the House on Thursday, which declares that no grounds exist for interfering with the Lord Chancellor's decree. So Mr. Charlton will be kept in gaol till he be "purged" of his contempt.

Mr. WYNN wished to have the *Morning Chronicle* summoned to the bar of the House for an article describing the "whipping-in" of Tory Members of the Committee to vote for Mr. Charlton. But upon Lord John Russell showing very clearly, that if the Tories began that warfare they would be worsted, and that Bishop Philpotts himself might

be "had up" for blackguarding the Irish Papist Members, Mr. Wynn prudently retreated.

The Foreign intelligence of the week deserves little attention. It consists chiefly of uninteresting rumours. In France, the prevalent notion that the Government is tottering gives rise to many reports of changes in the Ministry. Among the latest, is one that Thiers and Guizot have patched up a reconciliation, and that the former is about to rejoin his old colleagues. The King is like a prisoner in his palace. The fear of assassination renders it a matter of rejoicing when he goes abroad for an hour and returns in safety. There is an impression that the Royal Guard, which was disbanded at the time of the July Revolution, is to be reorganized for his protection. General Damremont is to succeed Clausel in the African command and it is said that the French Government has resolved to confine its possessions within as small limits as possible. Negotiations have been commenced with Abdel Koder.

The only piece of Spanish news worth mentioning is the arrival at St. Sebastian of a reinforcement to General Evans. That operations on a large scale will soon be commenced against the Carlists, is the general opinion; but the movements of Spaniards are very tardy.

It is mentioned in letters from Genoa and Leghorn, that the Carlists are actively employed in warlike preparations, and that a reinforcement of the French squadron off the coast of Italy has been ordered, with the view to stop the sailing of any vessel for the South of Spain.

SANTA ANNA, the President of Mexico, who was defeated and taken prisoner by the Texian adventurers, has been released and despatched to Washington, for the purpose of negotiating with the United States Government for a recognition of the independence of Texas; which he pretends that he is empowered to accede to on behalf of Mexico. It is said, however, that General Jackson doubts his authority, and will have nothing to say to him.

ATLAS.—FEBRUARY 19.

The Parliamentary proceedings of the past week are full of interest.

By far the most important measure that has for many years attracted the notice of the Legislature, was the bill for the relief of the Irish poor, as introduced into the House of Commons by Lord John Russell. Most heartily do we thank his Lordship for this boon—tardy though it be—to humanity. But some of the details demand alteration. In the first place the measure should at once become universal; it must not have the partial operation proposed by the noble mover. To erect ten or fifteen workhouses only, leaving the poor beyond the immediate district still to subsist on casual charity, would be worse than useless; it would create a spirit of discontent, perhaps even of insurrection, among the individuals excluded from relief. "If destitution were relieved in one district," observed Mr. O'Connell (who has been forced to swim with the current) "it would put in motion all the neighbouring distitution; and thus would be created an immediate excitement, since those who were not relieved would complain of injustice when they saw others relieved." This is indeed a monstrous proposition. Why should a few be selected, when so many thousands have equal claim to the advantage? Lord John must abandon this design of gradual operation. And there is another mischief—not mentioned by Lord John, but certainly mischievous enough. His Lordship spoke against the law of settlement, which he thought likely to entail great expense, not only by the inevitable litigation (so common in this country) in regard to the parishes on which the paupers might have a claim, but from the necessity of passing them from one parish to another. The law has no doubt its evils, but legislation is little better than a chain of them. If the destitute, wherever they may be, are entitled to relief, what will be the condition of the great sea-ports—Dublin, Cork, Waterford, for instance—where thousands of strangers, who are generally the poorest of mankind, arrive every week? How can the local functionaries know any thing of the previous habits and characters of such applicants? It is manifest that, unless both parties—dispensers and receivers—reside in the same parish or district; in other words, unless there be a settlement, no relief can be judiciously distributed. But even assuming, by way of hypothesis, that means might be devised to separate impostors from real distress how could such places as those we have mentioned support the enormous expense of providing, not only for their own resident poor, but all necessitous persons who might chance to arrive? The rates would exceed the whole rental The plan, then, being absolutely impracticable, must be abandoned.

A great argument in favour of a law of settlement is its tendency to check one of the greatest evils of Ireland—vagrancy. If paupers be allowed to prefer one workhouse to another, and if, as must sometimes be the case, it is considerably distant from the place where he may happen to be, he must of necessity be compelled to beg as he passes on his way. Indeed, Lord John Russell distinctly admits that until the law for relief come universally into operation, begging will be inevitable. This again, brings us to the objection of Mr. O'Connell—the dissatisfaction, the disturbance, that will inevitably follow where many applicants are unsuccessful. And there will be another evil, which, in our opinion, is greater than any that exists under the present system. Suppose—what must perpetually arise—that a poor man, after vainly applying to the workhouse, accost a passenger for relief; the stranger will naturally say, "Why not go to the workhouse?" He may reply, "I have been, Sir, and can get nothing!" Will he be readily believed? Will it not be suspected that he prefers vagrancy to labour?—that perhaps he has been refused because of his worthlessness? Hence he may, and probably will, be excluded from relief in reference both to the poor house and to casual charity. What, then, may rationally be expected to follow.

In some other respects the noble Secretary, we think, proceeding on erroneous data. He estimates the probable applicants for relief at 30,000, and the number of workhouses necessary for ultimately accommodating them (there is very properly to be no outdoor relief) at 100. If he treble the number of each, he will be much nearer to the truth. He assumes—and the assumption is no doubt a just one—that the Irish poor entertain great repugnance to a workhouse; that they will not enter one so long as they can possibly find the means of subsistence at home. If this repugnance be, as no doubt it is, owing to the intensity of their social afflictions—to their dread of being separated in such an establishment from their dearest connexions—still the same feeling must make them prefer even the evil, to the starvation of those they love. To see a beloved object in want, and ultimately dying by famine, is surely more distressing than such a separation especially when there is a knowledge that the object is provided with the necessities of life. We should not, indeed, be surprised if the number of applicants for relief be the quintuple of his Lordship's estimate.

How the able-bodied poor are to be employed (for they are humanly included in the noble Lord's plan); whence the funds for the erection of so many workhouses are to be derived; and some other matters, will shortly engross the attention of Parliament. One thing is peculiarly gratifying—the spirit in which the measure has been received by all parties. It does great honour to the ministry; and the manner in which his Lordship has introduced it deserves our highest commendation. He exhibits no obstinate attachment to minor details; on the contrary, he profes-

ses his readiness to receive any suggestion that may be made in amendment. Let him persevere in such conduct, and he will earn for himself a distinction immeasurably superior to that which birth has given him.

On Thursday evening Mr. Lushington, in accordance with his notice on the opening of Parliament, brought forward his resolution, "That in the opinion of the House the sitting of the bishops in Parliament is unfavourable in its operation to the general interests of the Christian religion in this country, and tends to alienate the affections of the people from the established church."

If this question be examined apart from the considerations with which it is usually connected, there can, we think, be no doubt that while the absence of the Bishops from their dioceses is and must be fatal to discipline, their presence in the House is of no advantage either to the kingdom at large, or to the Church of which they are the representatives. As temporal barons, their votes may be commanded by the ministry of the day, whose instruments merely they are. As spiritual lords, we have never known them attend to the real interests of the church, though nobody can charge them of being unmindful of their own. The truth is, the church is not represented. The parochial clergy, the curates—in short, the whole body except a few dignitaries, or men who hope to become such, have no means whatever of procuring either redress for real grievances, or advantages of which they have long been deprived by custom—that custom being the result of extreme laxity in discipline.

It is evident, and will, ere long, be generally acknowledged, that the House of Convocation should be restored; that the Bishops and a few peers should sit in one chamber, the representatives of the parochial clergy in another. But we would not give them an independent authority, for the church has never yet reformed itself, and unless some control were exercised over them by the secular branches of the legislature, the change would be worse than useless. No bill passed by the House of Convocation should have the force of law until it were equally approved by the two Houses of Parliament; and either of these Houses should, as at present, have the initiative—the power of rejecting or of approving being vested in the ecclesiastical body, as a co-ordinate branch of legislation in matters purely spiritual.

Accompanied by the restoration of this venerable assembly, we would gladly see the bishops relieved from a position which is neither honourable to themselves nor useful to the country. But unless this condition should accompany their removal, we would rather see them where they are. Assuredly we do not wish to witness the destruction of their influence; we would only have that influence exercised in a different and more salutary channel.

The decision of the committee of the House of Commons in regard to Mr. Lechmere Charlton, is such as we anticipated. Why indeed should a member of Parliament be less amenable to the laws of his country than any other man? The Commons have already privileged enough—more, we think than they ought to have. In the present case, certainly, there is abundant reason why they should have none. Contempt of the judge in Chancery is virtually contempt of the crown; and we have never seen the day when justice, and the fountain of justice, are to be beard with impunity by either Peer or Commoner.

In reference to the important principle involved in the decision of Lord Denman, "Stockdale v. Hansard," these observations are similarly applicable, if not in kind, certainly in degree. We will not, however, enter into the subject until we have the result of the inquiry for which a committee has been granted.

FACTION has been very busy in taking advantage of Dr. Mulholland's application to the House of Commons for an inquiry into the situation of the second order of the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland, to stigmatize the whole body. The case, however, is simple enough. What has the House of Commons to do with the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of that church? Why did not the reverend doctor confine his complaints to the ecclesiastical? He may, for any thing we know, have reason enough for complaining of his ecclesiastical superiors, who have probably little claim to our respect; but in appealing to a tribunal which cannot take cognizance of his affair, which has no jurisdiction, which he cannot invoke without a flagrant violation of canonical discipline, he has shown little wisdom. He will have his reward: he is rejected by his own people, and he will speedily be forgotten by the strangers whose party feelings he has endeavoured to enlist in his favour.

The termination of the trial *De Roos versus Cumming* has been such as we anticipated. From the evidence adduced we do not see how a different verdict could have been given. We have, however, no reason to think that his Lordship is, in respect to the charges brought against him, much worse than the generality of his associates. The disclosures that have been incidentally made must do good. They must open the eyes of the English people to the abominations which exist in those bandit dens, the gambling-houses. They must henceforth be held in detestation, and he who visits them—no matter how high his character in other respects—must be contented to sustain a considerable loss of reputation—to be regarded with something like suspicion by the honourable portion of society. What justification can he produce for such visits? If he is attached to play for his own sake, why can he not play for a trifling stake? If he wants money, why not betake himself to some honourable means of obtaining it—to means which may benefit himself without causing the ruin of others? He is, in fact, no other than a base adventurer; and his profession is less dignified than that of the highwayman, since he seeks by meanness, by low cunning, what the other attempts to gain openly and manfully. Why does not the law put down, by a summary process, these dens of iniquity?

The termination of another trial—*Morison against Harner*—has afforded us much less satisfaction. For obvious reasons, we shall say little on the subject. Its merits seem to lie in a small compass. If the pills are pernicious to the constitution, why are they not prohibited? If they may be taken with safety, why is not the fact openly declared to the world by high professional authority? That profession, we fear, does not discharge its duty to the public; it does not exercise any surveillance over the vendors of deleterious medicines. In this as in most other cases, the public must depend on their own prudence. Let them beware of any nostrums which are professedly designed for all constitutions; let them consider that what is harmless to one man, may be death to another. Who is to discriminate between these effects? Who is to judge how far a particular individual may venture in their use? Is it the pill-maker, or the pill-vendor, who has never seen you, gentle reader, in your life; or is it your own medical attendant who has by experience acquired an adequate knowledge of the peculiarities of your constitution? This question may be easily answered; and that answer may, and to every rational mind must teach a useful lesson.

Whatever may be thought of the pills in question, the verdict is a curious one. As it was at first published in the newspapers, it appeared that damages to the amount of 10*l.* were awarded to the plaintiff. That seemed to us to be a very singular decision. If the pills were good for anything, 10*l.* was a strange compensation for the attempt to destroy so profitable a sale; if they were a vile compound, why give that sum—why ten farthings by way of indemnification? But we find that statement to be erro-

neous. The following has been subsequently published as an exact copy of the verdict:—

On the first issue, verdict for the defendants. At the same time we are of opinion, if administered with discretion and judgment, Morison's pills may be safely used. On the second issue, for the plaintiffs; damages, 200*l.* This verdict is more extraordinary than the other. If the pills may be safely used, why should the verdict be for the defendants? To say that they may be safely used, if administered with discretion and judgment, is to say no more than may be said of any other medicine, or, indeed, of the necessities of life, which, if taken indiscreetly and injudiciously, must be attended with injurious consequences. The injudicious use of anything, however nutritious in itself, is dangerous. But who constituted the jury a proper tribunal to decide such a question? And of what value is their opinion in a matter purely medical, that can be decided only by men who have made medicine their study? It is possible that this verdict may do mischief—it is certain that it is preposterous and contradictory.

Lord De Roos left London on Sunday morning early by the Rotterdam packet. [Within a few hours after the finding of the Court of King's Bench in the case, "Right Hon. Lord De Roos v. Cumming."]

THE EX-KING OF SWEDEN.—The Ex-King of Sweden, Gustavus IV., known for many years past under the name of Colonel Gustavson, expired suddenly on the 7th inst., at eight in the morning, in the town of St. Gall. Gustavus was born on the 1st of November, 1773. Though under age, he succeeded to his unfortunate father Gustavus III., under the guardianship of his uncle, the Duke of Sudermania. On coming of age, on the 1st of November, 1796, he assumed the reins of government, and married on the 31st of October, 1797, the late Queen Frederica Doroshea Vilhelmina, a Princess of Baden, the daughter of Prince Charles Lewis. Later, he was crowned at Nienkeping. After various calamitous events, both to him and his kingdom, he abdicated on the 29th of March, 1809, and on leaving Sweden lived since November, 1813, under the title of Duke of Holstein Gottorp, and subsequently as Gustavus Adolphus Gustavson, alternately in Germany, the Netherlands, and Switzerland, the last three years at St. Gall. He died of a disease in the chest, the serious nature of which he did not suspect.

THE VIXEN.—We have not expressed any responsible opinion on the subject of the anticipated breach with Russia. Lord Palmerston describes the question as one of great gravity; a contemporary says—"We are in a hurry to learn the result of an inquiry which can only terminate in the most humiliating concessions on the part of Russia, or hostilities on that of England, if proper regard be had to the honor and interests of the British empire, and the liberties of Europe."

J. Kennedy, Esq. late M. P. for Tiverton, (who vacated his seat to make way for Lord Palmerston when defeated in Hampshire) is appointed Judge in the United Spanish and British Court at the Havanna.

TIMES.—FEBRUARY 22.

In the House of Lords last night numerous petitions were presented for and against the abolition of church rates, several of the latter by Earl Fitzwilliam, who took occasion to make several remarks which seem to us not to be characterized by his usual perspicuity; his Lordship sometimes leaned to the church view, sometimes to the Dissenters' view, of the question, without pronouncing any decisive judgment. But though his Lordship uttered no positive decision, he broached several extraordinary opinions, two of which to-day we must be content with merely quoting:—"As a member of the church of England, 'he should rejoice to see the day come in which the members of the church of England and the Dissenters, to whatever congregation they might belong, should agree 'together to worship their God within the same walls.' His Lordship afterwards states, 'that he should hail the day as one of the utmost glory to the church, when the Anglican, the Independent, and the Baptist, should meet to worship within the same walls.' His Lordship forgot, that the Socinians and Free-thinking Christians also enrol themselves among the class generally called Dissenters. Are they to worship within the same walls? Would it dignify the character of any building dedicated to Christian worship, to have on the same day not merely contradictory doctrines preached in it, but doctrines which are directly subversive of each other—to have the morning preacher enforcing the divine mystery of the atonement, and the evening lecturer denouncing it as a mere childish fable?"

One more quotation, and we have done, at least for to-day. His Lordship said, "he would go further" (certainly no small distance further), "and say, that if it could be proved to him that in any parish in England any other sect was more numerous than the church of England, then he, as a member of that church, should have no objection to surrender to that sect ecclesiastical property within that parish. His own opinion was, that if the members of Dissenting congregations were more numerous in any place for a certain length of time than the members of the church of England, then they ought to be invested with all the ecclesiastical rights and privileges." In the course of his speech his Lordship also touched with disapprobation on the subject of the Church Commission, which, as was justly observed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, had no connexion with the matter before the House. His Grace, and the Bishop of London, made some remarks worthy of attention; the latter especially well exposed the sort of theological Babel which the noble Earl's scheme of miscellaneous worship would most certainly produce—may, a worse than confusion of tongues—a monstrous confusion of ideas and principles.

Lord MELBORNE concluded the conversation with some observations which will elicit a smile from most of our readers. The King's Prime Minister, with a *naïveté* which reminds us of the simplicity of another "Prince's officer," Señor Dogberry of Messina, thus unconsciously described himself and his colleagues:—

"They" (His Majesty's Ministers) "had been attacked on all sides, and on all the grounds which could be imagined. While one party assailed them because, forsooth, they had exhibited the recklessness of a Wat Tyler and a Jack Straw, another denounced them as trembling under the effects not of hesitation merely, but of timidity to boot. Surely they were most strange persons to be thus inconsistent—to be thus, in the same place, by the same words, because of the same determination, at actual utterance not merely with all parties, but with themselves."

Was ever a more correct, a more striking likeness painted? And yet to think that the master hand which sketched this "Cabinet picture" should not himself recognize the truth of his own delineations, nor the force of his own colouring! Is this owing to excessive modesty or excessive deficiency in self-knowledge? In either case the fact is marvellously whimsical.

Previous to this discussion, the Marquis of Lansdowne stated, that he held in his hand a document, in pursuance of a motion made by a noble Baron (Ellenborough) opposite, on the subject of money raised on the security of church-rates. He had found that he should be compelled to wait for an inconvenient time if all the parochial authorities were communicated with. He should, therefore, for the satisfaction of the noble Baron and the House, lay on the table an abstract of the amount of money lent on the security of church-rates up to 1835: and he

moved, in addition, for a similar return up to the present time.

At the close of the sitting, the Earl of Shaftesbury brought up the report of the Grand Jurors (Ireland) Bill. The Births, Deaths, and Marriages' Registration Bill was read a third time, and sent to the House of Commons, and the House adjourned.

In the House of Commons a great number of petitions on various subjects was presented, and both Stephenson's and Rennie's Brighton Railway Bills were read a second time, for the purpose of being referred for discussion and examination to a committee.

Sir ROBERT PEELE said, that he had been requested to present to the House a petition from Dundee, signed by 1,050 individuals. It related to certain vessels which were confined in the ice at Davis's Straits; and the petitioners prayed the grant of a sum of money sufficient to fit out an expedition to go in search of the missing ships. If it was possible, he hoped the petition would be complied with; and he earnestly recommended it to the consideration of His Majesty's Government, as they were more qualified to judge than that House whether its prayer ought or ought not to be granted. If they could interfere, he was perfectly sure that that House would sanction any grant of money necessary to rescue those unfortunate individuals from the perilous position in which they were placed.

Mr. RICE, after observing that "if the Government were to interfere in all such cases it might lead persons embarking on long and dangerous voyages to neglect taking those precautionary measures which were absolutely necessary to protect the property and the lives of individuals, added that a petition for a grant of money was unnecessary, as the Government were perfectly ready to take any responsibility upon themselves if a case could be made out to justify their interference. He (Mr. Rice) was ready to produce the whole papers relating to the subject, if any hon. member would call for them."

Sir ROBERT PEELE said, "he should take an early opportunity of moving for the production of the papers to which the right hon. gentleman had alluded."

In answer to a question from Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Rice said "he was confident he should be able to bring forward the church-rate question on Thursday."

Mr. O'CONNELL asked whether the Government had any measure in contemplation relative to the Bank of Ireland?

Mr. Rice replied, that as a committee had been appointed to inquire into the nature and operation of joint-stock banks, and as that inquiry extended to Ireland, he could not give a satisfactory answer till the result of that inquiry was known.

In answer to a question by Mr. Hawes, relative to the erection of the new House of Parliament, Mr. Rice related that "in compliance with the recommendation of the committee, some estimates of that expense which would attend the execution. Those estimates were now being prepared, and he expected that they would shortly be in a condition to be communicated to the House."

In answer to a question from Major Cunningham Bruce, Mr. Rice stated, that "the attention of the Government had been directed to the distress which was said to prevail in Scotland. An inquiry had been instituted on the subject, and as soon as the result was known measures to meet the extent of the distress would be adopted."

The debate on Lord E. Egerton's motion (on which we have made some remarks in the next article) was then resumed, and adjourned at a quarter past 12 o'clock till to-day.

The debate on Lord Francis Egerton's motion again adjourned. Mr. Sergeant Jackson opened the debate, and was last evening in an unimpeachable exposure of Lord Mulgrave's misadministration in Ireland, and of the inevitable consequence of the Government policy pursued by the present Government in that country. After one or two other Irish members had spoken, the member for Lincoln, Mr. E. L. Bulwer, delivered himself of a series of out-and-dried epigrams, which, in our opinion, and to all appearance in the opinion of the House, would have more appropriately figured in the list of those works of fiction to which the hon. member is indebted for whatever public attention he enjoys. For instance, when speaking of O'Connell's unconstitutional influence in Ireland, as forming no just ground for expecting to pass a measure which would strengthen that influence, Mr. Bulwer said "the power of a man is but 'for life, the effect of legislation is immortal.' If we are to affix any meaning to this piece of pompous nonsense we must presume that the hon. novelist anticipates a perpetuity of evil consequences from bad legislation. If so, we agree with him, and in the enduring mischief of Popish tyranny see far more to apprehend than that passing influence, pestilential though it be, of such a person as O'Connell. Mr. Bulwer also said, that "justice to Ireland" could not be understood in Conservative philosophy. He then favoured the House with his philosophical interpretation of the phrase. He defined its meaning to be the "just application of equal laws"—a definition which was anticipated and answered by Lord Stanley on Monday night. But Mr. Bulwer probably could not omit the particular passage without disturbing the symmetrical arrangement of phrases which he had got up by way of a speech. He, as well as Mr. Bulwer, followed the example set by Sir John Hobhouse, of asking Sir Robert Peel what he intended to do when he came into power with reference to this question of Irish Corporations? and, as the Right Hon. Baronet made no reply, the member for Lincoln betook himself to conjecture, declaring his conviction that Sir Robert Peel would act on the principle which he himself had recognized in the concession of the Catholic claims—namely, the principle of yielding to numerical force, not as regarded the divisions within the walls of the lower House of Parliament, but as regarded the constituencies out of doors. We shall not presume to anticipate the reply of Sir Robert Peel, who, as was said by Colonel Perceval, will, if he think it worth his while, put an extinguisher on the novelist by a single sentence; but we cannot help remarking, that the youngest member of the House cannot, or ought not to be, ignorant of the absence of all similarity between the state of national feeling in England on the subject of the Catholic claims, and that now existing with reference to the Irish Corporation Bill. We were surprised to find Lord Howick taking up this very absurd ground. His Lordship declared that Sir R. Peel had yielded emancipation to the clamours of the Catholic Association, and he asked whether the General Association of this day was less formidable? We cannot but marvel at the coldness of this query coming from a member of the Cabinet, which, after calling on the Orange Association to disband, has openly countenanced and fostered the Popish Parliament here spoken of. But, notwithstanding this, we flatly deny that, with all the patronage and encouragement of Government, the Association of the present day is equally formidable with that of 1829, and for this simple reason—that the declared object of the latter was the removal of civil disabilities from Popery, whereas the undisguised aim of the actual confederacy is the extermination of Protestantism in Ireland. But, says Lord Howick, there is nothing so absurd as putting and not going further. The profound statesmanship of this we leave to the animadversion of his Lordship's noble father, Earl Grey. He was absurd enough to pause, seeing, as Lord Howick ought to do, that if unimpeachable bodies are to force such cowardly con-

cessions as those advocated by the present Government, there will be never wanting a pretext for unconstitutional associations. What did that plain-spoken Radical, Mr. Roebuck, last night tell Lord Howick and his colleagues? That he supported their Municipal Bill because the corporations proposed would train the people for democratic government. To be sure they would! But under the guidance and control of the Parliament of priests and pacificators assembled in Dublin! As Mr. Shaw said the bill proposed might give people the power of managing their own concerns; but the Popish demagogues, clerical and lay, would step in and prevent the people from exercising that power, excepting according to their high will and pleasure. By adopting the proposal of Lord Francis Egerton and the Conservatives, the local self-management of all that concerns the well-being of the towns in Ireland would be secured, and the evil now complained of eradicated. But, said Mr. Shaw, the Government wish not to eradicate the evil, but to transplant it. The Catholics, forsooth, must have their turn, and this question, called by the Whigs a vital one, is so not to the interests of Ireland, but to the ascendancy of that Popish faction, by whose sunderance and support those Whigs are maintained in power.

The letters and journals from Madrid, dated the 12th instant, have reached us, but contain no intelligence of interest. The Cortes at the commencement of the sitting of that day had passed a resolution, having for its object to invite the Minister of France to bring forward the bill without any further delay. A sum of 2,400,000 reals had been sent off to General Sarsfield, 600,000 of which were intended for the Algerine Legion. The Portuguese Auxiliary Division is to remain in Castile, and its chief, Baron das Antas, had been appointed by Exarpero commander of the army of operations of the left.

Letters from Bayonne of the 16th inst. contain no account of the long threatened movement of the Christians. Don Carlos was still at Andoain on the 14th. On the preceding day some skirmishing had taken place between the belligerents under the wall of Vittoria. The Carlists were throwing up works of defence round Iru, and lining with artillery the ramparts, on the French side, to repel the attack of the Anglo-Christians in that direction. The artillery of the latter had not yet reached Socoa.

Another letter from Bayonne, dated the 16th inst., states that the authorities in that town received orders on that day from Paris to return a negative reply to the demand made by General Evans to be allowed to land and convey six pieces of artillery, which were to be then conveyed across the French territory to the Christiano fort of Behobia. The same letter states that, on the 14th, General Evans the Spanish Generals Jauregui and Rendon, and two British brigadiers, had held a council of war at St. Sebastian. General Evans having communicated to them his plan of campaign, Jauregui observed that, from his personal knowledge of the enemy they were about to encounter, having at one time fought in their ranks, he would recommend that a perfect understanding should exist among the Christiano chiefs before they commenced operations, as the fate of the campaign would depend on the manner in which the first blow was struck. The expeditionary forces should march forward, he said, at any risk, penetrate into the interior of the insurgent territory, and not think of returning to St. Sebastian, for if they did, they would never be able to quit it again. It was necessary to strike terror into the souls of the peasantry of Guipuzcoa, if they wished them to submit, and the system of military reconnoissances heretofore followed had had the contrary effect of encouraging them in their rebellion. The officers present at the meeting concurred in Jauregui's opinion, and the commencement of the operations was accordingly deferred until the 20th, in order that they might be fully prepared for the campaign.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

SATURDAY MORNING.—Nothing has occurred in the English Money Market since the 23rd of April. Consols have fluctuated between 90½ and 90¾. Exchequer Bills and India Bonds have improved. The closing prices yesterday were, Consols, 90½; for Money and the Account; Exchequer Bills, 90½; India Bonds, 23 25; Money, Four per Cent.

In the Foreign Market business has been confined to the Spanish Market which has improved considerably, having been done up 23 on Thursday; yesterday, however, they declined to 22½ and closed 27½; Passive, 7½; Deferred, 12½; Portuguese Five per Cents, 49½; Ditto Three per Cents, 31½; Dutch Two-and-a-Half per Cents, 54½; Ditto Five per Cents, 103½; Colombian, 25½; Mexican, 25½.

CITY, TWELVE O'CLOCK.—Consols are 90½ for Money and the 23d instant, and 90¾ for the 12th April; Exchequer Bills, 27 29; India Bonds, 23 25; Spanish, 27½; Passive, 7½; Deferred, 12½; Portuguese Five per Cents, 49½; Ditto Three per Cents, 31½; Dutch Five per Cents, 103½; Ditto Two and a Half per Cents, 54½; Colombian, 25½.

ONE O'CLOCK.—The following are this day's prices:—Bank Stock, 208 7½; 3 per Cent. Reduced, 91 90½; 3 per Cent. Consols, 90½; 3½ per Cent. Red., 98½; 3½ per Cent. New, 15½; Long Ann. Jan. 1860, 14½; Anns. Oct. 1859, 25 23; India Bonds, 23 25.

EXCHEQUER BILLS.—27 30; 2000 1000, 28 30; Commercial, 26 29.

CONSOLS FOR ACCOUNT.—90½; 3½; City, Five o'Clock.—Consols closed at 91½ for Money and the 23d instant, and 90¾ for the 12th April; Spanish, 27½; Passive, 7½; Deferred, 12½; Portuguese Five per Cents, 49½; Ditto Three per Cents, 31½; Dutch Two and a Half per Cents, 54½; Ditto Five per Cents, 103½; Colombian, 25½.

Tuesday Evening.

There appears to be no doubt that the Liverpool merchants have formed the intention of making an application to Government for advances on the security of those articles of produce now lying in the Government warehouses, which they cannot dispose of in the present state of the markets, except at a ruinous loss. A meeting was held on Saturday, and another was to be decided whether or not a deputation should be sent to London to solicit assistance from the Treasury. If properly backed, there is an expectation here that the application will be successful, chiefly, founded on what occurred in the year 1826, when the application, however, were much more numerous, and applications, London as well as the principal outports. It may be amiss, therefore, on that account, to revert briefly to what took place at that period, the particular circumstances of which can hardly be within the general recollection. The application in that instance came before the House of Commons in a petition of the "merchants, bankers, and traders" which was presented by Mr. Wilson, then one of the members for the city, on the 23d of February. In doing so he urged that if the merchants were driven to sell, it must be at ruinous losses; they therefore prayed for an issue of Exchequer-bills, agreeably to a course that had been previously adopted in times of temporary pressure, and with good effects. Much discussion took place, and so strong a case was made out for some measure of relief to the mercantile interest, that the Earl of Liverpool even-

tually undertook, if the Bank consented to purchase Exchequer-bills in the market, to afford the required aid to the extent of 2,000,000. The Bank at first refused, but ultimately that body was convinced that it would be prudent to comply with the arrangement. The plan finally settled was, that the Bank should make advances to private individuals upon the deposit of goods, merchandise, and other securities; and that the whole sum to be advanced was not to exceed 3,000,000. Commissioners were appointed to carry the plan into execution in the principal commercial districts; and, in consequence, the gloom began to disperse, and confidence to return, so much so, that it is recorded that "the applications for assistance were far from being so numerous as might have been expected from the loudness and unanimity of the cries for relief; and at some of the provincial stations the office of the commissioners was almost a sinecure." In fact, the knowledge that a public fund existed ready to advance money to those who could furnish substantial deposits infused general confidence, and speedily restored mercantile activity.

In the English stock-market there was not much business done, partly owing, perhaps, to the arrangements making for to-morrow, that being the day for the settlement of the February account. The previous quotations, however, were fully maintained in Consols till towards the closing of the market. The price then receded to 90½, and for the April account 90½. Exchequer-bills improved, leaving off at 31½, to 33½ premium, as did India Bonds, which closed at 26½, to 28½, Bank Stock was again quoted at 207 to 209.

The foreign stock-market was heavy, and prices looked down. Spanish closed at 27; Portuguese 5 per Cents, 49 to 51; and 3 per Cents, 31½ to 32½; Colombian at 25½ to 26½; and 2½ per Cents, left off at 53½ to 54½.

In the share-market there was a little activity in some of the speculations. Among the quotations were Greenwich at 3½ pm.; Great Western, 8 to 9 pm.; Southampton, 11½ to 10½ dis.; South Eastern, 1½ to 1 dis.; Birmingham, 40 to 45 pm.

The foreign exchanges have been nearly stationary this afternoon. It is remarkable that all the efforts made to raise them, which have produced the greatest scarcity of money, and a general decline in all articles of import, should have had no other effect than that of merely preventing the further depression of the foreign exchanges. It is a common observation that the execution of the spring orders which are now coming forward must turn the balance of trade considerably in our favour; but it is much to be feared, under the present pressure for money, that even that branch of trade cannot be carried on with proper activity.

By the advices from Hamburg the price of gold is 434 per mark, which, at the English Mint price of 3l. 17s. 10½d. the ounce for standard gold, gives an exchange of 13.9½, and the exchange at Hamburg on London at short being 13.7½, it follows that gold is 0.81 per cent, dearer at Hamburg than in London.

The premium on gold at Paris is 10 per mille, which, at the English Mint price of 3l. 17s. 10½d. the ounce for standard gold, gives an exchange of 25.40, and the exchange at Paris on London at short being 25.37½, it follows that gold is 0.10 per cent, dearer at Paris than in London.

The course of exchange at New York on London is 110 per cent., and the par of exchange between England and America being 109 23-40 per cent., it follows that the exchange is 0.42 per cent, in favour of England.

The report of the Secretary of the Treasury made to the Congress of the United States concerning the State Banks contains, among its tables, a comparative view of the condition of all the banks in the United States for the years 1834 and the two successive ones. From this it appeared, that in 1834 the circulation of the banks was 54,020,000 dollars. In 1835 it was increased to 140,000,000. All the liabilities of the banks in the year 1834 were 195,000,000; in 1835 they had swelled to 330,000,000; and increased one-half and the liabilities proportionally nearly one-half.

The Legislative Council of the territory of Florida, sitting at Tallahassee, has introduced a bill, entitled "An Act to indemnify the people of Florida for losses sustained during the insurrection of the Seminoles." The bill provides that the Governor be authorized to appoint an agent to repair to the headquarters of the army, and to demand from the Commander-in-Chief all negroes, mulattoes, and others, held in slavery or bondage by the Seminoles Indians, and all horses and cattle now captured or which may hereafter be captured, by the army. The bill assumed that it was a Florida war in which the United States had no jurisdiction or claim whatever; and that, therefore, the captures in war were to be disposed of by the Governor. It was taken for granted that the Governor would never sanction the bill. Its concluding clause provides, that when the claims of individuals are adjusted, the Governor shall cause the property of individual Indians to be sold at public auction and divide the proceeds among the people of Florida. The General Government has expended upwards of \$5,000,000 to put down the Seminole guerrilla warfare, and the bill thus proposed to reap the fruits of it.

Since the observations in the preceding article were written, a letter reached us late last night from our Liverpool correspondent, in which it is stated that the intention of applying to Government for assistance had been for a time at least, abandoned. (From a Liverpool Correspondent.)—We stated in *The Times* of yesterday, that so severe had been the pressure for money at Liverpool at the close of the preceding week, the commercial classes in that town had been discussing the propriety of applying to the Government for pecuniary assistance. The meeting, to which allusion is made in our previous statement, was held on Monday last. We are not fully informed of what took place at the meeting; we are informed, however, that while the East India, the West India, and the Mediterranean Associations seemed to think that Government assistance would not only be desirable, but absolutely necessary, to enable some of the merchants engaged in the trades to those quarters to avoid ruinous sacrifices of property to meet their engagements, the American Association did not think that an application to Government was either desirable or necessary. As in any application of the kind commercial men should be united, and as union could not be obtained in the present case, it was understood in the course of the afternoon that all intention of applying to the Government for pecuniary assistance was, at least for the present, abandoned. The favourable accounts from the United States, and particularly the rise in the price of cotton on Monday, had re-inspired confidence, and sanguine hopes were entertained that the difficulties which seemed so formidable on Saturday would gradually disappear, and render the interposition of the Government unnecessary.—*Times*, Feb. 22.

ARISTOCRATIC GAMBLERS.

The people of this country have been so long habituated to regard gambling, in one form or another, as the favourite amusement of persons of rank and fashion, that it is only an extraordinary sensation caused by some flagrant exposure, such as the recent trial of Lord de Ros in the Court of King's Bench, that awakens them to this stigma on the Aristocracy. Game and gaming are the all-absorbing pursuits of the "higher orders" of society; these share their otherwise undivided attention. The passion for play seems to have been inherited from their Norman ancestors by "the proud Barons of England" with their titles and estates. Gambling, so far from being considered disgraceful, is a necessary accomplishment of

a young man in the fashionable circles—it is the first step on entering the world. The introduction of a *parvenu* to titled society commonly takes place in the betting-stand or at the card-table; and the aspirant for the honours of nobles' acquaintances and the entree among the exclusives has generally reason to remember his novice. With idle people amusement is the business of life—pleasure is their toil; and success or risk beyond others is the distinction which "young men of spirit" eagerly seek after: this is the height of their "low ambition." Some of those who have been plundered retrieve their ruined fortunes by preying upon others in turn; and the reputation of superior skill and good luck is the flimsy veil to arts that are only dishonourable when detected. That successful at the gaming-table is not considered discreditable, we have a remarkable proof in the instance of one in nearly the highest rank of nobility, who, in addition to his hereditary estates, has amassed a princely fortune by gambling, and whose splendid fetes draw together the whole world of fashion and royalty to boot.

As there is a kind of "honour among thieves," so there is among gamblers. A loss at play is called a "debt of honour" *par excellence*; and it would be thought disgraceful to pay a bill for goods which the tradesman had bought to supply his customer, in preference to a claim for a few thousands depending on the turn of a card or the speed of a horse—or of two drops of rain on a window-pane. The late Duke of York afforded a signal instance of this high sense of "honour" for, rather than leave a debt of honour unpaid, he subjected his creditors to heavy losses, and even ruin, and his memory to the reproaches of plebeian folks who could not understand the morality of his conduct. Doubtless it was this noble example that procured for him the statue and lofty pillar which commemorate his virtues. "Betting-men" have a very acute feeling of wounded honour. Lord de Ros insisted upon the vague imputations against him being put in the most distinct shape, and subjected to public proof in a court of law, not content with declaring that they were "false," and repelling them, "with scorn, indignation, and defiance." Indeed, such is the high tone of morality among gamblers, that some of the witnesses in Lord de Ros's action, who detected him in practising unfair tricks, continued to play with him, and lost and won by the result of these tricks, rather than impugn his honour. This not only shows extreme delicacy towards him, but a sense of the inestimable value of character. They were reluctant to believe the evidence of their senses; they hoped he would forsake his bad habits; and at last, when they were in a manner compelled to substantiate their suspicions by proof, they proposed a private investigation.

Neither this sensitiveness on the score of character, however, nor the "noble and honourable" persons who compose the élite of fashionable gamblers, will prevent the public from feeling that the exposure on the trial of Lord de Ros exhibits the Aristocracy in a degraded position. The scenes disclosed at the fashionable clubs cannot but lessen the "higher orders" in the estimation of the people. The *Standard* is unable to refrain from expressing "severe mortification," though finding "grounds of congratulation" in the circumstance that very few indeed of those names whom the public is accustomed to respect appear to be connected with even innocent gambling. No doubt, it is some consolation that so few appear to be implicated; but the *Standard* truly observes, "their present position is the reverse of enviable." We suspect, however, it will be thought that but too many would fain have "appeared," and that these bear a very small proportion to the number of those that did not "appear." Another source of consolation to the *Standard* is, "our Universities," but this is unhappily weakened by the fact that Lord de Ros was educated at Eton and Oxford, and that Lord Albemarle, and other officers high in the Army, though not Members of the Legislature, are shown to be in the habit of innocent gambling. The *Standard* further remarks, "the Peer may be, as the *Standard* says, of weak mind; but he is also described to be 'at the head of the Bachelors' of England, and one of the most powerful men in the aristocracy of England." The very extension of Lord de Ros's influence, which the *Standard* deprecates, is a source of consolation to the *Standard*, but the *Standard* is not aware of the fact, that the "contemptible ambition" of being considered the first whist-player in England, that led the unfortunate plaintiff to practise cheating at cards, shows how strong is the infatuation among a class whom more solid motives would not be supposed to influence; which leads them to associate with gamblers by profession, and to join them at play not merely as a relaxation for an hour or two of an evening, but at "morning whist," which seems the ordinary pastime at the Clubs, where high stakes are played for.

That these practices are not considered dishonourable among the aristocratic class, is quite evident. Sir William Lubbock appeared to be utterly insensible to any thing like shame when he exhibited his knowledge of the mysteries of whist; we dare say that the unvarnished net is not so well versed in the principles of "as a science of whist" as the Attorney-General, who very readily admitted that his winnings amounted to 500,000 in the course of fifteen years—a sum that would enable lawyers "lick their lips." As Sir John Campbell, and Captain Alexander, though shy of admitting that they followed play as an occupation, did not hesitate to avow that "he was 10,000, the better for it," and Henry Bentinck too confessed that he was "very deep," with the air of a man that felt it to be a credit at least.

Lord de Ros's accusers spoke of "dishonour" as would be inflicted on society by the exposure of a nobleman to his Lordships rank and station, and Mr. Lubbock's defendant's counsel, was apprehensive that the "dishonourous body"—meaning our hereditary legislators—would be "wounded through the occurrence," at a time when Lord de Ros's attack is made upon every thing that is noble and honourable in the land. Is then, the credit of "all that is noble and honourable" based on so slight a foundation that the exposure of a solitary cheat would affect its stability? Is it to be feared that people will suspect the gamblers of cheating, and thus many a black leg.

What a spectacle it is to see our legislators, who are themselves for the discharge of their senatorial duties, playing "morning whist!" What a senseless and unrepresentative of the People have the values of the money, how well qualified by habit must they be to cope with the condition of the taxed and the labourer, and the pressure of the public burdens on the honest labourer of the labourer, and the probable loss to the honest men by debts of honour! how high a standard of morality in reference to character, must be that of the gamblers with professed gamblers, men who avowedly live by trade! What a school wherein to study the distribution of government patronage and pensions!

The swindler and pickpocket are detected and punished at the Old Bailey by the discovery of their misdoings; but the aristocratic gamblers, through all grades of crime and vice, escape detection; they betray his true character. What must be the impression on the minds of the people, who habitually frequent the gaming-table, when they now understand how it is that the nobleman, whose flaming doors are ever open to traitors and unwary, are suffered to exist. It would be an

Printed at the Courier Press, by SORABJEE DORABJEE.